A.S.W.
N.Y.

The COMPASS

AMERICAN · ASSOCIATION · OF · SOCIAL · WORKERS
130 E · 22d · St · New York City

MAY, 1937 VOLUME XVIII, NUMBER 8

AASW IN INDIANAPOLIS

TUESDAY, MAY 25

11 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

(Joint Session with the Committee on Social Treatment of the Adult Offender, Group Discussion 4 of National Conference of Social Work, American Association of Psychiatric Social Workers and American Association of Schools of Social Work)

The Place of the Social Worker in a Penal or Correctional Institution

2:00 p.m.-3:30 p.m.—Palm Room, Hotel Claypool

Local Participation—LINTON SWIFT, Presiding Officer

A meeting on the problem of organization for the purposes of professional functioning of the individual and the development of responsible leadership. The chapter's problem of limited experience and facilities in connection with its natural concern with everything that concerns social workers.

Under the auspices of the AASW Committee on Chapter Organization and Program, Mrs. Everett R. Castle, Chairman.

Of special interest to national and local officers and candidates for office.

THURSDAY, MAY 27

9:00 a.m.-10:30 a.m.—Egyptian Ball Room, Murat Temple

(The professional Association's meeting of the membership, open to all Conference members)

Current Issues in Professional Practice

Personnel

RETIREMENT PLANNING FOR SOCIAL WORKERS AS ONE ASPECT OF THE PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM—LINTON SWIFT, President, AASW, Presiding

GOVERNMENT PROVISIONS—WALTER WEST, Executive Secretary, AASW

PRIVATE AGENCY PLANNING—HELEN I. FISK, National Division on Employment Practices

Services

THE PRESENT ISSUES IN FEDERAL AND LOCAL RELIEF PROGRAMS—WILLIAM HODSON, Chairman, National Division on Government and Social Work

2:00 p.m.-3:30 p.m.—Palm Room, Hotel Claypool

(A meeting for AASW members)

Problems of Equipment for Social Work Practice

THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS EMPLOYED TO ADMINISTER SOCIAL SERVICES—WALTER WEST, Executive Secretary, AASW

EVALUATION AS ONE ASPECT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS—MRS. ROBERTA TOWNSEND, formerly Assistant Administrator, Central Relief Bureau, Philadelphia

Discussion leader—DOROTHY KAHN, Director, Central Relief Bureau, Philadelphia

Special arrangements for consultation with national office staff, national and chapter officers, committee personnel and members, by appointment at the AASW booth; also exhibits and sale of publications. Miss Fisk and Mrs. Townsend will be available by appointment for some time on the day following presentation of their papers on special problems.

The Relief Crisis in Ohio

The Ohio Council and the Cleveland Chapter were asked to send reports on the present relief crisis in Ohio for this issue of THE COMPASS *as it was thought that the situation there was typical of what was happening in various sections of the country. The report on the state angle was prepared by Arch Mandel, Chairman of the State Council and also Chairman of the Dayton Chapter. The report on Cleveland was prepared by Henry L. Zucker.*

THE STATE

Ohio is enjoying another relief crisis—the third since January of this year. These crises become increasingly serious because, as the months roll by, the conviction on the part of the public and of the legislators that relief is not needed becomes increasingly strong.

In 1936 the state and local sub-divisions spent $27,462,870 for direct relief, most of it being state funds. The estimated need for 1937 ranges from $17,000,000, the estimate of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, to $26,000,000, the Governor's estimate. A legislative committee estimate of $20,000,000 is probably a more accurate figure. Stop-gap legislation, pending the enactment of relief appropriations for the present biennial, provided $6,000,000 for relief from January 1 to April 15. Of this amount, $1,000,000 was earmarked for flood relief. This money was more than exhausted by the latter date, by which time it was hoped legislation would have been enacted to provide relief appropriations for the remainder of 1937 and for 1938. Bills were presented in the House and in the Senate calling for state appropriations to be matched dollar for dollar by local sub-divisions. However, in order that the latter might be able to raise the necessary funds, enabling legislation was required. Apparently agreement on methods of raising this money by local sub-divisions could not be reached and no such legislation was enacted. Adding to the existing confusion, of which there was considerable, the Senate stood firm on "no new taxes" because it believed that from $7,000,000 to $10,000,000 could be procured by reduction in the Governor's biennial appropriations bill, and until such reductions were made it would not vote money for relief.

Without going into further detail this is how the relief situation now stands in Ohio: The Legislature adjourned on April 29 (in reality on May 2) without passing an appropriation for relief and without passing the biennial appropriations bill for the state. In the last few days of the session, with the situation acute, emergency legislation was again passed, appropriating for relief and expected excess in the 1937 intangible tax. This will allow the local sub-divisions to carry on for a month or six weeks. The most significant phase of this emergency legislation was the return to the municipalities and townships of responsibility for relief, disbanding the county relief administrations. This was done because the Legislature felt that these smaller units of administration, presumably knowing their people more intimately, could eliminate the ineligibles from the relief rolls. In brief, Ohio is back where it was before the depression in the matter of responsibility for the administration of relief.

What will happen within the next few months we do not know. The thinking of the General Assembly on relief may be summarized as follows:

First: Relief rolls, particularly in the urban counties, are "loaded" with ineligible recipients and a thorough "purging" will follow complete local financing either by counties or cities and townships. This will result in a true picture of actual needs and reveal the necessity or lack of necessity for state aid.

Second: Some counties and sub-divisions have not been entirely frank in disclosing their local resources; and until they are forced to do so, the state is justified in remaining temporarily out of the relief field.

This attitude of the General Assembly seems to reflect the attitude of the public. Neither can understand why, with peak employment, there should be so many people on relief, as compared with 1929. For example, in Montgomery County, in which Dayton is located, there are at the present time 4300 cases on direct relief, approximately 6000 on WPA and 3600 on old age pensions. In 1929 we had no WPA, we had no old age pensions, and the peak relief load for the county was approximately 900 cases. Industrial employment and payrolls in this vicinity are above the peak of 1929. This situation makes it difficult for the people to see the need for such relatively large expenditures in relief.

Of the 4300 cases in Montgomery County, 43 per cent are definitely unemployable and 33 per cent partially unemployable. This the public must come to realize. Our problem seems to be to convince the public that we are furnishing relief only to those who are eligible. We, of course, believe that in the main we are doing this. The paradoxical situation, however, is that while the Legislature for the past two years has been shouting about the padded relief rolls, it has so limited administration expenditures that effective administration was made impossible.

In the next few weeks cities which now have the responsibility for relief will be out of money for relief. The Legislature seems unwilling to provide any; the cities, under existing laws, cannot raise money except by popular vote for special levies or bonds. There will have to be a special session but what the outcome will be we do not know. Even a sit-down strike in the Governor's office in the last days of the legislative session had no effect. The sit-downers were ejected and the leaders arrested. The social workers have not been able to get to first base, not only in relief legislation, but in any welfare legislation.

In the meantime everybody is jittery from the clients up—or down.

ARCH MANDEL

CLEVELAND

You get an idea of what Cleveland is facing in the problem of relief from the following excerpts from the city editor's column in the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* of May 5th:

> "After the week-end fiasco, your first reaction (and possibly your best) would be to label the current Legislature the all-time, all-Ohio Cheese Champions. . . . The only excuse they had for convening at all was to solve relief and pass an appropriation bill, and they folded up in a big row without doing either. . . . The House was hog-tied to the so-called governor, Martin L. (Too Marvelous for Words) Davey. The Senate was equally tied to the joint cabal of business interests, which Paul Yoder has been stage-managing. Each tried to out-bluff the other, and both failed."

Thus, the old familiar story of the relief ship getting caught on the shoals of politics. Needless to say, every prejudice has been appealed to—urban vs. rural, Cleveland against Ohio, taxpayer and chiseler, etc.

Typical was a well-timed statement from the state auditor's office, claiming that 40 per cent of the relief clients in Cleveland were not in need, and that the Cuyahoga County Relief Administration was dominated by Western Reserve University, which attempts to perpetuate jobs for graduates of that School. No facts were given out to substantiate the allegations and the director of the Cuyahoga County Relief Administration was unable to secure a copy of the report. Privately the local auditor pointed out that relief standards are too high, and that judgment ostensibly makes 40 per cent of the clients ineligible! Unmentioned, too, was the fact that less than 15 per cent of the staff are members of the AASW and many of these not graduates of the Western Reserve University School of Applied Social Sciences.

After a series of six stop-gap state relief bills following the federal government's abdication on relief (December 5, 1935), marked by failures to plan, short-sighted restrictions on administration, and short-time appropriations, the present legislature adjourned, and returned to the municipalities the responsibility for financing and administering relief.

In Cuyahoga County, which has had its administration on a county basis since August, 1933, the City of Cleveland on May 1st was forced to set up an Emergency Division of Charities and Relief in its Welfare Department. Subsequently in an arrangement made through the County Mayors' Association, this Division was empowered to act in the capacity of relief administration for the outlying subdivisions under the name of the Metropolitan Relief Administration. The MRA, which retains the staff of the old Cuyahoga County Relief Administration, will be directed by the Cleveland City Welfare Director, serving under an administrative board of seven, composed of two representatives each from the city and county, plus three from the outlying subdivisions. Its source of financial support is $500,000 in undivided surplus intangible taxes, which the subdivisions have voluntarily agreed to use for relief. Relief needs in Cuyahoga County have been running about $750,000 a month.

Drastic action was believed necessary to impress the state with needs and with efforts to "purge the rolls" of the ineligibles. Nobody mentioned that we ought seriously to consider soup kitchens, but an intelligent mayor of Cleveland did suggest the pauper's oath, and a few stray voices were heard to say that the private agency could do it better. The "flight from relief" was becoming reality.

After the threat of chaos, it became clear that the city recognized its obligation, the private family agency made it equally clear that this was a public responsibility, and the public officials called on the leaders in public and private social work to help work out a plan.

The City Welfare Director put forth a three-fold program. First, it was decided to re-register all recipients of relief by having them call at the relief district offices by appointment to fill out a single sheet form listing certain pertinent financial and employment information. Those unable to come to the office would be visited at home. The second part of the program calls for a visit in the home of every client, and the third part requires that clients call for their orders at the relief office.

In order to complete the first two parts of the plan by May 31st the public and private social agencies were asked to organize a selected group of volunteers and to loan trained workers from their own staffs to tide the relief administration

over the emergency period. To date about 50 different social agencies and some women's organizations have provided about 300 volunteers and 200 trained social workers to help.

Lying behind these plans are the following factors:

1. The feeling that the inadequacy of the relief administration, due to restrictions on administrative costs, has made necessary a rapid investigation of individual needs which would at the same time safeguard the client as much as possible.

2. The desire to impress a skeptical state legislature that Cuyahoga County is making a conscientious effort to cut the relief rolls.

3. The same for certain groups of local taxpayers.

4. The desire to get a better informed special public (lay and professional) out of which would grow some plans for a long-time attack on the problems of unemployment and relief. It is the hope that volunteers meeting many relief clients still in desperate need will serve as interpreters in the community of the need of adequate relief planning.

Among the chief negative features in the situation are the following:

1. The added uncertainties to the 90,000 individuals subsisting on direct relief in this county. There is even much careless talk about reducing relief allowances although the food item is now 10 per cent under the minimum adequate standard of the U. S. Children's Bureau, clothing is given only on an emergency basis, and housing presents the most pressing of all relief needs.

2. The obvious backward step in the withdrawal of state and county funds and the change from county to local administration.

3. The almost complete breakdown in morale in the staff, which after innumerable crises and in the face of inadequate salaries, is subjected to much unwarranted criticism by people who wish to discredit them.

4. The damage to professional social work, which with the relief client is sharing the position of "goat" for the situation which the public seems indisposed to face. Professional social work throughout this community will undoubtedly suffer from the indiscriminate attacks made upon the "professional workers who are seeking to perpetuate their jobs" with the public relief agency.

5. The utter lack at this late date of public comprehension of the problem of unemployment and relief.

6. The possibilities for political maneuverings, with the state and county governments of opposite political persuasion from the city mayor who is up for re-election this year.

7. The question of how relief is to be financed for the last week in May and beyond, with no money in sight from any source.

More hopeful signs are these:

1. The Cleveland City Government seems to be coming to grips with the realties in the relief situation.

2. There are indications that the Chamber of Commerce and other critical groups of taxpayers are beginning to appreciate their responsibility for a constructive solution to the problem.

3. The short-sightedness of the administrative restrictions are becoming more and more evident, so that it may yet be possible to stop the rapid flow of trained personnel away from the relief administration.

4. Other agencies are more and more convinced of the common stake of the whole social work field in the underpinning we call relief.

5. Other agencies are also more impressed with the need for an adequate interpretation of what social work training means.

6. There is some talk of a thorough-going study of unemployment and relief in Cleveland, which might have some far-reaching values beyond the immediate one of showing Cleveland what is its problem and how it should be met.

7. There is some hope that a special session of the legislature will be called to tackle the relief problem and possibly to begin to face it.

HENRY L. ZUCKER

Mr. Hoare of the national office staff is convalescing from a surgical operation. His absence has sharpened the staff's appreciation of what he adds to the running of the business of the Association. The work of the office has been slowed up perceptibly; and it has been necessary to cancel completed plans for his visit to five or six chapters and the Texas Conference of Social Work.

It is hoped that Mr. Hoare will be well enough to take up his place in the affairs of the Association at the Conference in Indianapolis.

THE COMPASS
Published monthly except September by
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS
130 EAST 22ND STREET NEW YORK, N. Y.
VOLUME XVIII NUMBER 8

Officers
Linton B. Swift, *Pres.* Grace Abbott, *3rd V-Pres.*
Harry Greenstein, *1st V-Pres.* Leah H. Feder, *Sec.*
Martha A. Chickering, *2nd V-Pres.*
Stanton M. Strawson, *Treas.*
Walter West.....*Executive Secretary*
Florence Taylor.....*Editor, The Compass*

Entered as second-class matter at the post office in New York, N. Y., under the Act of August 24, 1912
Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1924.
Subscription: Non-Members $1.00 per annum. Subscription of members of the Association included in annual dues.

Is Unionization Compatible with Social Work*

VIRGINIA P. ROBINSON

This paper, with the author's permission, is published in THE COMPASS *because it sets forth some premises on which the question can be profitably discussed, and shows wherein the social work union will necessarily, as an organization, determine for itself the question of compatibility, by what it decides to adopt as its difference or similarity in the matter of training for social work. Miss Robinson's considered opinion is, clearly, that the question which she was asked to discuss cannot be decided in a vacuum, but only in terms of responsible action that may be taken by a group which operates in a professional field, but which has not yet accepted the necessity for a training discipline, as, for instance, the American Federation of Teachers has done.*

I WOULD like to make clear at the outset that I am not here to debate on the question before us, for the reason that I do not believe we have in this problem of staff organizations in the field of social work today anything so simple, so clear cut, that it can be stated in terms of an "either-or" a "for-or-against." We have before us a new problem created by new conditions, by forces which have moved with more speed and energy than the understanding which alone can direct and organize them has been able to see its way. I am not here to propose or defend to you a solution for this problem. I don't know the solution.

My interest in addressing you tonight is to see if we can find a new approach to these complicated issues, to this problem which concerns all of us who have a stake in the development of social work and of a social security program for this country, the trained professional worker equally with the novice who is going out on a case load for the first time without training or experience.

Let me describe, first, the personnel situation in the field of social work today, as I see it in terms of the forces that are active. Six years ago, to make a guess, a majority of you in this room had never heard of social work, or if you had, it may have been at some weak, sentimental, despised member of your class at college had had a calling to that service. As opportunity for jobs failed in other fields and social work opened up in unemployment relief you turned to it on graduation from college, or as older workers with training in other lines of work. You found on the staff of this hurriedly-organized emergency relief organization a few workers who had had long experience in professional social work in the private field, practiced in offering service of various kinds to people in need—need which was individual in those days and which presented itself individually and was warmly and generously responded to by case work agencies supported by private contributions. This experience in private case work did not automatically and completely qualify workers to organize, administer and supervise in the new social and economic situation resulting from the depression. Need in the mass stared social workers in the face, demanding new diagnoses and a new philosophy of treatment. Social, economic and political forces must be held responsible and social workers had to move into the political area and try to add skill in social action to their equipment as social case workers. The size of relief organizations in big cities called for administrative skill of far greater scope than had been required to administer a small private agency. Case workers who had had no experience beyond handling a case load of forty or fifty moved into supervisory positions in the relief field where they became responsible for thousands of cases and had to train unskilled workers to carry them while they were adjusting their own philosophy and techniques to the demands of this new situation. That relief has been so honestly, so considerately and so efficiently administered on the whole is a great tribute to the intelligence and adaptability of social workers, as well as of the untrained visitors.

Many of you who entered this field of relief administration in those early days were scornful of social work and professional workers. *Social Work Today*, the rank and file magazine, as you know if you read its early issues, started off with an attack on everything in social work. It reviled its philosophy as conservative and reactionary; it accused it of capitalistic domination. Social action alone was worth while and social work as a technical, professional field received scant consideration in its columns. As you know if you follow this magazine, its interest has shifted in the past year and there is now some real concern with technical problems.

From the time of the opening of the first relief bureau and the appearance of the first number of *Social Work Today*, the social philosophy of every individual in this country has been modified to some extent by the inevitable movement of social change on a world-wide scale driven by powerful, cataclysmic forces. We've lost the naive faith in

* A paper given by Miss Robinson as part of a Forum conducted under the auspices of the National Coordinating Committees of Social Service Employees, on March 23rd, 1937, in Philadelphia.

panaceas in which some enthusiastic idealists saw the solution four or five years ago. No longer can those who find our democratic process too slow and awkward point with unshaken confidence to another country as having found the perfect solution. There is more acceptance of this country with all its bungling as the place where we have to work out our social and economic salvation if we can, more willingness to struggle with our democratic forms as having the possibility of including and protecting more human values than do the extremes of Fascism or Communism.

Because I believe there is evidence of this general shift in social philosophy, I would be willing to stake a good deal on a guess that social workers and rank and file workers are nearer together today in social philosophy than they were five years ago. I would believe that the passage of social security legislation has brought them very definitely on to the same broad general platform, though there may be a wide difference in their attitude towards bringing pressure to bear for modification of this legislation to secure adequacy of grants and broader coverage of need.

I would be surprised, however, if members of the rank and file could agree with me on this proposition, but would expect rather to find them insisting on their radical difference from the social worker, which I too believe exists, in methods of securing social action.

The point of greatest difference as I see it where conflict is sharpest between social workers, the small professional group, and the large, untrained and semi-trained group of rank and filers is this point of difference in training. To discuss this I would have to give you some explanation of what I mean by a professional job in the field of social case work.

Social case work, by which I understand the process of giving help from a function limited and defined by a social agency to an individual who seeks it, has only recently in the last ten years earned the right to be considered a profession. Social case work is becoming a professional enterprise as it is accepting its limits and its responsibilities in this help-giving, help-taking process and as it is working for the development of skill in this process. The narrowly defined, severely limited function of relief-giving has made a tremendous contribution to the understanding and control of this process. Because of the contribution which the function of relief administration has made to case work philosophy and practice, I for one should be sorry to see relief workers define their job on the level of unskilled, unprofessional labor. I realize that there is a real trend in this direction.

The distinctive mark of any professional worker in any field may be looked for in his skill, keeping in mind of course that skill is inseparably bound up with knowledge. Around this point of skill we judge professional competence. The competence of a teacher, for instance, depends on his skill in imparting knowledge, in helping the other person to learn. He arrives at this skill through study, training and discipline. Every year sets new problems as each class and each individual has its own way of learning; it should bring also new development and personal satisfaction, greater assurance and ease in this professional use of himself.

No skill is of more importance and better understood by the community than the skill which the medical profession has developed in diagnosis and treatment of disease. This skill has reached the level of development where four years' training is taken for granted and demanded as a minimum before practice is permitted. If we have a serious physical problem which may require an operation we seek the best surgeon we can find who has demonstrated and developed his skill in experience and there is the difference of day and night in our whole attitude, even in the speed and ease of our recovery, when we really accept the knowledge and skill of the surgeon, and know that he knows and can go straight about his task without bungling.

An illustration of another type of helping service in which skill may be demonstrated, but which few would be willing to consider professional, can be found in selling. A clerk who knows her stock and has the interest and the skill to help you find and buy the article you desperately need and despair of finding is rare, but she can turn a gloomy shopping expedition into a holiday occasion if you happen upon her. Many shopping expeditions serve only to convince us that the clerks and the stores are banded together in a dark conspiracy to prevent us from buying.

The skill of the surgeon in handling living human tissues and organs and the skill of the clerk in handling her stock and her customer's needs in relation to it are wide apart. One skill requires knowledge of the human organism and its functioning parts, an understanding of the meaning of health and disease. It rests upon years of experience in handling diseased or malfunctioning parts, in interfering with the relation of those parts and studying their reactions as they reassume their own functioning; it grows out of responsibility taken for the life of another person. The skill of the clerk, on the other hand, is obviously a lesser sort of thing. The responsibility she accepts either for the product or the customer, compared with the surgeon's responsibility, is relatively insignificant, but there is something here that the very skilled clerk accepts which makes us feel like saying of her, with

gratitude for the quality of the service, "she certainly does a professional job." I believe that this good selling job rests on two factors—genuine belief in the product she is selling, and capacity to see the customer's reactions in relation to it and to let him come to his own decision. I don't know enough about the selling process to say how much training is required for a person to learn to function skillfully here.

Where will we place social case work skill between these two kinds of skill which we recognize as far apart in what they demand of training, of responsibility and use of the self? First, we must consider the fact that social case work, by definition and practice, is always administered by agencies or institutions or bureaus, never by an individual case worker operating on his own professional responsibility as a doctor practices medicine. Even where a doctor practices in a hospital we distinguish his skill as individual from what the hospital contributes. But the client who seeks social case work help seeks it in the social agency first and finds it expressed in the person of a case worker or visitor who carries out the function of the agency. The relation of the worker to the agency resembles more closely the relation of the clerk to her shop or her product than the relation of the doctor to the hospital, but the service the social agency offers is far more important in terms of human and social values than the product the shop has for sale. The visitor represents the agency to the client in every contact and every decision, and is an integral and important part of a process in which everything in the agency must function if the client is to be able to make use of its service. Conditions of agency set-up, application rooms, policies, procedures, and records, as well as the skill of supervisors and visitors play a part here.

Now the first question we need to take a stand on today as citizens is, do we believe that the services of a relief bureau, and of bureaus of assistance for the blind, the aged, and mothers with dependent children, are of importance in the welfare of the community, of as much importance as hospital service and educational service? If we do believe this, are we interested in seeing these services administered with a full measure of help and efficiency to those in need?

If you can accept with me that service to the client is the essential purpose for which these agencies exist, their "product" if you will, and that we would like to see that product as good as possible; if you can accept with me further that the quality of this service grows out of the functioning of the agency as a whole, of the participation of every worker in this service, you may understand something of the problem the union creates when it treats a social work agency as an industrial organization and cuts the administrative and supervisory functions off from other functions in an effort to make them like managing functions in industry. This they are not and cannot be made to be. If the rank and file succeeds in creating this distinction and forcing the administrative and supervisory powers into a separate camp, they can drive social work out of these activities. Then they will have to solve the problem of learning how to run them on some other basis yet to be discovered.

I would like to quote Ordway Tead in an article in *The Social Frontier,* January, 1937, which discusses a school system or an individual school as a functioning whole in the same way in which I am describing a social work organization. He says:

"The task of administration is to establish an enthusiastic, creative unity of intent among all groups involved. And the leadership of the total enterprise has the task of showing all the groups in and through their satisfactory shared experience how in very truth their creative interest in the enterprise transcends and harmonizes their lesser special interests. These groups as such do not exist for themselves; but because there is an objective to be served—in this case the progressively better administration of the school system. And they justify themselves to the degree that while protecting rightful group interests they also make the total pursuit of the common purpose more successful. . . .

"The administrative process is not a necessary evil of organized education. Rather it is part and parcel of the successful conduct of the educational process itself. It can be creative and organically integral with education itself just as soon as it is representative in structure and fundamentally democratic in spirit.

"The task of administration is literally a creative one. But it is creative at its best only when all the responsible groups share in creating the policies of the ultimate administration and when the several groups involved develop the leadership which can point the way to loftier aims and improved pedagogical methods."

The public social agency today has a problem in achieving the kind of integration Mr. Tead describes that does not exist in any other professional enterprise. This problem is created by the fact that untrained and semi-trained personnel form a large majority on the staffs of most public agencies and in unionizing for their rights and protection have as yet no standards of training which are accepted as necessary for the jobs they do. As you who are organized at the present time compare yourselves with other unions you must

be struck by this contrast—in every other field of employment except unskilled labor, workers have their craft or professional skill as their accepted equipment in entering the trade or industrial union. The American Federation of Teachers is perhaps the closest in level of job done to relief and assistance work. In this organization it is taken for granted that a teacher establishes his competence through training and experience in teaching. In joining a union for the protection of their rights for salary, academic freedom and tenure, teachers approach these problems responsibly as trained professional workers rooted individually in responsible relationships to the classes and children they teach, to the standards of the curriculum, to the whole administrative purpose of the school of which their teaching is a part. This preliminary basic professional training in the knowledge of subject matter, in educational philosophy, in teaching skill, is taken for granted.

I am frankly concerned for the development of sound thinking and responsible action in a group which operates in a professional field and has not accepted the necessity for a training discipline. That you yourselves are concerned with this problem, the activity of a Training Committee in the National Coordinating Committee under whose auspices we are speaking tonight, testifies.

The real problem that blocks social workers and rank and file workers alike in thinking a way through this difficult situation is that nobody really knows the minimum of training which is absolutely required to do a skillful, competent job as a visitor in a public relief agency. The lay point of view is that anybody can do it without training. My own experience in preparing people for professional social work convinces me that this help-giving process can use all the training and development any individual is willing to give to it. Life and death issues may be active in the attitudes of the client who comes to make an application for relief and the interviewer who has the sensitivity and skill to handle these feelings may operate as professionally as the doctor and with as therapeutic an effect. Practically I know that this job can be well done, even admirably done, with less skill than this and that it must be if the jobs are to be filled. We know that there are not enough well trained, experienced people to carry the very responsible work of administering and supervising in this field, much less to fill the visiting jobs.

When I look at the work of the Relief Board in Philadelphia County, I know that many visitors who came on that staff without training of any sort have learned to carry a case load efficiently and skillfully—I would say with real professional competence—through experience on the job alone. Others with the same experience have not acquired skill, but are repeating their original performance in a mechanical, unchanging way. They cover the case load and get by; they do not carry it responsibly. Now this difference you may say depends on native ability or previous education or experience. But I believe there are two other factors of far greater importance. First, there is the factor which lies in the worker's attitude towards the organization as a whole, whether he can become a part of it believing in its service and accepting responsibility for interpreting this service to clients. Workers who do this are accepting discipline and developing skill with every case they handle; workers who split their real selves off from the function on which they are acting accept no discipline and develop no skill. The second factor lies in the worker's attitude towards himself as a worker. Does he see himself as a person able to learn and change and develop in the job, or does he accept himself as static and want the job to furnish the security which will permit him to remain as he is? Workers who fear change, who want to remain static, will fight any movement towards raising standards of performance in the agency and will resist supervisory influence.

No one knows better than I do how haphazardly training has been introduced into the public social work field—too much here, too little there.

Speaking for Philadelphia alone, where I accept responsibility, I realize that training must have seemed about to swamp you at times when all your supervisors were taking courses at the school and you may have felt that if you didn't take an "Attitudes and Behavior" course you might lose your job. The fault was ours, the school's, and your trained and in-training supervisors, in that we had not yet learned how to keep the powerful dynamic of a training interest separate from the relief job. Every relief worker felt some impact from this whole professional training process. Some were involved in it and sought training for themselves; more have reacted to protect themselves by organization for their interests where they hope to get the control into their own hands.

I think we've come through that stage of development to a point where we can stop and look around us to see where we want to go. The professionals are attempting to find an answer to these questions: how much less than full professional training is necessary to carry the visiting job; what training on the job can be used; what development can there be in this job on the level where the average visitor carries it which will

not set up the complete professional training process, but which will have in it its own movement and growth, with incentives and substantial recognition of skilled service?

The rank and file workers have a real choice, I believe, to make at this point. The first is an individual choice which you can only make by separating yourself from your union for a little time and examining your own individual purpose. Do you want professional training, professional development and professional responsibility? Your National Coordination Committee is on record as endorsing "a comprehensive training program at agency expense on agency time." This is not what I mean by professional education. Professional education is always on the individual's time, at individual expense, at the cost of struggle and sacrifice to the individual. No one should choose professional training lightly. Only the finest intelligence, the sturdiest courage, the most enduring purpose can stand up to its demands. Those of you who choose professional development must be prepared to move out of the rank and file into supervisory and administrative responsibility, and for the majority who choose to stay with the visiting job, a training process is indicated which has not yet been isolated clearly as distinct from a full training process. I believe it belongs primarily in the agency, that it should be on agency expense and agency time, and that courses in the school should play, if any part, a very slight one. I also believe that the Philadelphia County Relief Board staff is better qualified to make a contribution to this difficult educational problem than any staff I know. By staff, I mean its administrative, supervisory and visiting staff, working together, with recognition on the part of the visiting staff that they have something to learn and that their supervisors have something to teach. Without this there can be no educational process.

As a group, the rank and file may be faced with the opportunity and the responsibility of determining to a large extent by its attitudes, its action, its choices and its decisions, the development of the level on which public relief and assistance work will be carried in this country for many years to come. Do you want it carried on the static level of granting job security to the poorest visitor on the staff, or on a level in which the average and best visitors can find satisfaction in learning to function to the very limits of their capacity?

I see all the place in the world for staff organization for the expression of the interests and the unique concerns and contributions of the staff. The very life and functioning of a large agency must depend upon the activity of the different groups within it or related to it, expressed as constructive, positive, creative contribution, not just as pressure or protest against agency policy. I would certainly agree that better working conditions and more adequate salary scales should be important concerns of staff organizations. But I would add a factor of far greater importance—concern for the standards and the rewards of work in terms of human and professional interest. If a merit requirement is secured, an essential we all believe in for the development of any decent working conditions, will the blanketing in of all employees and tenure set a low level which will remain static? If so, the public job will provide security, but no stimulus and satisfaction for any but third-rate workers. A job must contain in it opportunity for change and improvement, for growth in terms of a developing standard, or it will deteriorate. It remains to be seen whether the large public agency can provide opportunity for creative work, as well as for job security. My own knowledge that the Philadelphia County Relief Board has made possible some first class learning experience for students and some creative experience for workers and supervisors, furnishes me my greatest support for the hope that this might be possible.

I personally believe that creative working experience can only come about in an agency where the staff as a whole works together for the common purpose of the agency, each part accepting its different function within the whole. I do not know how it can be achieved where one group in the organization gives its greatest loyalty to an outside group and its hostility to other functions in the organization. From my own actual observation I don't know to what extent a strong tie-up with the union which carries identification with all workers in industry must necessarily conflict with the administrative and supervisory functions in a particular organization. I must leave this to you to answer from your own experience. In that answer lies for me the very crux of the problem before us.

Reprints of "Social Work as a Profession" from the *1937 Social Work Year Book* have been secured by the AASW. This article, prepared by Grace Marcus, is a useful brief description of professional social work development which can be brought to the attention of those who might be interested in such a statement, but would not be likely to know of its availability in the *Year Book*.

* * *

Members wishing to have their address changed in the national office files are urged to give at least two weeks' advance notice whenever possible. As the number of address changes is very heavy each month, changes cannot be made immediately and a member may not receive *The Compass* and other communications promptly at his new address unless advance notice of two weeks is given.

THE UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND SOCIAL WORK

ELIZABETH COSGROVE
United States Civil Service Commission

For twenty-five years the United States Civil Service Commission has been holding examinations for positions in the federal government in the field of social work. During those years, as now, it has sought the guidance and assistance of social workers. Positions in departments of the federal government were few and so the problems of examination and the rating of experience were not great. With extension of services under the Social Security Act there has been a remarkable increase in the number of examinations for which social workers seek to qualify. The problems of rating experience and the preparation of examinations which will recruit qualified social worker staffs for the federal departments have become important.

In August, 1936, there was appointed to the professional staff of the Commission a full grade examiner, with experience in several fields of social work, who is a member of the American Association of Social Workers. On her lies the responsibility of interpreting to the Commission standards, terminology and objectives of social workers. The degree of success with which this can be done depends to a large extent upon the articulate support of the schools of social work and the professional association and all who are interested in seeing that the social workers in government service are competent representatives of their field.

Her role on the Commission's staff is still being written. Her immediate obligation, however, has been to assist in the grading and rating of social work experience as it has been described on applications for examinations. *Compass* readers who are interested in taking steps that will lead to the simplification of the problem are asked to submit through the National Division on Personnel Standards for the use of the Commission their own recommendations or the results of local chapter discussions.

Thousands of applicants from 48 states and the District of Columbia, and from Alaska, Canal Zone, Hawaii and Porto Rico file applications for examinations requiring experience in the field of social work. Their experience in that field ranges from a few months to many years. The agencies represented vary from those where one individual comprises the agency to those employing hundreds of social workers. The geographical areas in which they function scale from small units to the nation. The standards of performance show a wide scatter.

While many announcements for examinations require types of specialized experience in various fields of social work, the problem of rating any experience in any field remains the same. The absence of a formal statement of standards which might form the basis for establishing the comparative merits of applicants constitutes the problem. Experience in an agency known in its own community to be doing work not in keeping with best professional standards might be given the same recognition as experience in an agency of high quality. The Commission, seeking available professional guidance, is faced with the necessity of determining standards. It will continue to meet this necessity as best it can until formal professional guides are available.

With rapid expansion of social work programs calling for federal appointments this problem of evaluating experience has become a serious one. The United States Civil Service Commission is desirous of establishing registers containing, in proper order, social workers who will be most valuable to the federal departments using them. With no basis of standardization for rating, social workers with good experience compete with social workers whose experience might be considered inadequate preparation for the positions for which the examinations are held.

There are several ways in which the problem might be considered. The details of any plan for grading of types of agencies, however, would follow discussion of the feasibility and value of adopting one. Mention is made of the increasing problem at this time so that the total membership of the American Association of Social Workers will be made aware of the hindrances to accurate evaluation of social work experience. These hindrances will exist so long as there are no criteria for use by the Commission.

Another part of the problem of rating social work experience lies in the fact that many applicants fail to describe clearly and comprehensively the nature of their duties. There is no limitation to the amount of description applicants can give in order to state accurately what they have done. It has been observed that many social workers with apparently good experience failed on examinations or were rated lower than the quality of their experience might warrant

because they were unable either to analyze their work or to tell simply and clearly what they did or they took it for granted that everyone else knew the implications of certain types of experience in the social work field. It appears that many social workers assume that others outside the field understand fully what social workers mean when they use such terms as "case work," "social research," "supervision," "intake," "group work," "community organization," and "welfare administration." On examinations where there are many thousands of applicants there are examiners from many professional fields. A simple definition of all terms used by applicants helps to crystallize the content of applicants' experience. A comprehensive description of experience leads to an accurate rating and may actually lead to professional recognition, since such recognition comes in any field only after professional performance has been demonstrated.

Social work recruitment, types of examinations, method of certification, principles of classification are all being given thoughtful study by the Commission. Progress and hindrances to progress will be reported in *The Compass* from time to time.

The Commission has now opened its registers to states for the appointment of any social workers on those registers who wish a state appointment whenever the states wish to use the registers. Communications from states desiring to make use of this service should be addressed to the Chief Examiner.

REPORT OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Submitted by Frank J. Bruno, Chairman, to the Meeting of the Executive Committee of the American Association of Social Workers, April 23, 1937.

Although your committee was elected during the summer, it was not possible to have a meeting until the time of the Executive Committee in December. Four of the five members of the committee stayed over one day and held a preliminary meeting on December 13.

At this meeting the committee attempted to make no nominations but confined its discussion to the recommendations of the last nominating committee and the criteria which should be used in choosing the nominees for this year.

The following decisions were reached:

1. To follow recent custom and ask the president of this year to accept nomination for a second term.

2. To consider the other offices principally as places on the Executive Committee, and to act on the theory on which the members of that committee are elected, namely, that their value is increased by a period of service on the Executive Committee of more than one year. Therefore, to recommend the re-election of the three vice-presidents and secretary, all of whom have served but one year, but to fill the place of treasurer by a new election, as Mr. Strawson had served for two years.

3. That one member of the Nominating Committee of next year be a member of this year's Nominating Committee. (This decision was later modified by nominating a member of this year's Nominating Committee as one of the two nominees for chairman of the Nominating Committee. This change was made on the theory that the membership of the Association should be given a chance to express a judgment on that point.)

4. That a letter be sent to the chapters asking for:
   a. Nominations for both offices and committee members
   b. Opinions on methods or criteria for choosing nominees

such as: territorial, functional groups, religious and racial groups, practitioners vs. executives, men vs. women, nationally vs. locally known, how to determine competence. Replies were asked for by January 20th.

Answers were received from only eleven chapters by the time of the meeting of the Delegate Conference, February 19th, at which time the Nominating Committee was asked to meet. However, only two members of that committee were able to be present and so the meeting consisted of looking over the material and making certain decisions to be sent by mail to the members of the Nominating Committee, to be accepted or modified.

On the matter of criteria for selection of national officers and committee members, general approval of a fair distribution between the various groups mentioned in the circular letter was given; but the real insistence from all chapters was that the real consideration is territorial distribution.

The eleven chapters and two committee members submitted about one hundred names.

The two members of the committee then adopted the following procedure:

1. Compared the list with the roll of members at the 1937 Delegate Conference and past officers and committee members.
2. Made up a slate of candidates for each office, consisting of several times as many as were finally to be nominated.

3. Sent this slate to the members of the Nominating Committee, asking them to indicate by number their order of preference among the candidates for each office and for each committee member.

This was done, and the vote of the Nominating Committee resulted in the presentation of the final slate, with one exception. Miss Grace Coyle of Cleveland, who was one of two nominees for Chairman of the Nominating Committee, said she could not accept, and so the next highest candidate was nominated.

The selection of Frederick Daniels for the office of Treasurer left a vacancy on the Executive Committee for one year. Nominees for this position were secured by choosing the next two in the list of preferences, and agreed to by the members of the Nominating Committee.

As it was important to get the list completed in time for insertion in the April *Compass,* communications with the Nominating Committee and with the candidates to secure their acceptance were by telegraph. The complete slate therefore appeared in the April *Compass.*

For the guidance of the next nominating committee, we recommend:

1. The continuance of the policy of considering the offices of the three vice-presidents, secretary and treasurer as positions on the Executive Committee; that in general each one shall serve three years, but that they shall not change all at once, preferably that they be elected, two one year, two the next, and one the third year.

2. That chapters be circulated early asking them to consider the question of nominations for national officers and committee members and specifically that they submit lists of names for the various positions, and express their judgment on criteria of selection.

3. That the national office of the American Association of Social Workers have available as complete a file as possible of names of persons who have served the national association in any capacity, as a guide to the nominating committee in making its new selections.

* * *

Members of the Nominating Committee in addition to the Chairman, Mr. Bruno, were: Helen W. Hanchette, Cleveland; Betsey Libbey, Philadelphia; George W. Rabinoff, New York City; Forrester B. Washington, Atlanta.

"Merit" Principle for Committee Appointments

Preparatory to the appointment of personnel for national committees for the year 1937-38, a communication has been sent to the chapters by the Executive Secretary asking their assistance in building up a resource list of members with particular qualifications of interest, availability, professional understanding and special knowledge which would make them valuable members of national committees.

In presenting the need for such a list to the chapters, together with a list of all national standing committees and a brief description of their assignments, Mr. West suggested that the "merit" principle might well be applied in this connection. He outlined this idea as follows:

"What the Association really needs for committee membership is to employ as far as possible the merit principle. In some kinds of committees, of course, 'merit' depends on the representative factor. For instance, in a committee that has policy making or executive functions it is important that different parts of the Association geographically should be included. For such committees geographical distribution becomes of great importance in determining 'merit,' even though interest and experience in professional development remains the major factor.

"The officers and executive committee need to be a group which takes broad responsibility for all aspects of the program. It delegates certain responsibility to national committees. In setting up some committees, such as a division on personnel standards, the matter of first importance is the qualifications of the individual members to deal with that subject. . . .

"In the Association we are dealing with the development of professional activities without much guide from experience in other fields and many times without being able to adapt other types of organization experience within the social work field. That is to say, the development of a professional program is different from the development of a social work program and we need to learn our way as we go. For that reason many of the national committees are required to do a great deal of close thinking during the process of developing subjects and finding useful activities which can be recommended for the Association program. . . .

"We also regard as a matter of 'merit' that the committees retain year after year sufficient experienced members so that as much progress as possible may be made. It is, however, also recognized that some new members should be added from year to year.

"A further 'merit' principle established in the early days of the Association is that membership on national committees in so far as possible should not be limited to those members who are able to bear personally the expense of attending committee meetings. Until a few years ago this applied only to the Executive Committee. In 1928, for instance, there were fifteen members of the Association on the Executive Committee and the

Association budget provided for travel expense to meetings of eight members, the others being within reach of the national office. At the present time the Executive Committee represents ten chapters and reaches out as far as the Pacific Coast. In addition expenses of all national committee members are paid for regularly called meetings. At the present time there are 115 members of committees whose attendance at meetings is on an expense basis. These members come from twenty-seven chapters. . . .

"Expense is not the only limitation that affects the matter of distance. Frequency of meeting and the difficulties of convening committees composed of widely scattered members, all have their bearing on the problem of the extent of geographical distribution of committee members. The most difficult factor of all, however, is that of acquaintance with the qualifications of Association members and their availability for committee work. . . ."

Chapter chairmen were asked to send names of some members of the chapter who they felt would be valuable members of national committees on this merit basis, supplemented by information regarding the interest and activities of the members suggested, and the reasons for presenting the name.

Committee on Illness and Invalidity Benefits

Following the discussion of illness and invalidity benefits at the Delegate Conference, the Division on Government and Social Work has appointed a committee to study this subject. The committee has held one meeting and will hold a second meeting at the time of the National Conference of Social Work. Members of the committee are: Harry Greenstein, Baltimore, Chairman; Katherine Tucker, Philadelphia; Karl de Schweinitz, Harrisburg; Margaret Wead, New York City; Helen M. Crosby, New York City; Gordon Hamilton, New York City; Frank Bruno, St. Louis; Frank Hertel, Cleveland; Michael Davis, New York City; Samuel Goldsmith, Chicago; Antoinette Cannon, New York City; Mrs. Edith Seltzer, New York City.

Maintaining Chapter Contacts

Members who are temporarily in the territory of another chapter, but who do not wish to change their mailing address are urged to get in touch with the chapter in which they are temporarily located, so that they may participate in the activities of that chapter during their temporary period of residence. Chapters have always been glad to put on their mailing lists the names of members from other chapters who wish to have an opportunity to maintain contacts with the Association during brief periods of residence in another section of the country for purposes of study, special work or for any other reason.

Informal arrangements of this nature with the chapters do not affect the mailing address in the national office, as *The Compass* and other notices continue to go to the member's permanent address in the chapter to which he belongs.

The Administration of the AASW Program

National and local activities have increased the scope of national Executive Committee work and the work delegated by it to Ad Interim and other committees and divisions, throughout the past year. Heavy agenda have characterized the meetings of these various bodies and the schedule of recent meetings has also been heavy as shown by the list given below.

The two-day April meeting of the national Executive Committee received reports on and pointed up the problems in many subjects which have been under discussion during the year. These included routine Association affairs, administration of membership requirements, the broad questions of personnel standards, employment practices, and government and social work, the AASW meetings during National Conference of Social Work, and future delegate conferences, chapter organization and programming, the distance problem in organization, and work of the Nominating Committee.

Actions of the Executive Committee and progress on subjects under study will be reported in the June issue of *The Compass*.

National Divisions and Committees holding one or more meetings during April and May are as follows:

- Executive Committee
- Ad Interim Committee
- Conference Committee
- Committee on Chapter Organization and Program
- Division on Personnel Standards
- Division on Employment Practices
- Committee on Retirement Provisions of above Division
- Division on Government and Social Work
- Committee on Illness and Invalidity Benefits of above Division
- National Membership Committee
  - Sub-Committee on Technical Requirements
  - Sub-Committee on Section 6
- Housing Committee
- AASW-JVS Joint Committee

Bill to Amend Social Security Act

Congressman John W. Boehne, Representative from Indiana, has introduced a bill, H. R. 6442, which would amend the Social Security Act so that employees of social agencies as well as those of other non-profit agencies would be included under the old age provisions of the Social Security Act.

Other proposed amendments are expected to be introduced in the next few weeks. Whether hearings will be held by committees of either the House or Senate has not been decided.

Possibility of broad changes in the Social Security Act, particularly as to proposals extending its scope, beginning benefit payments earlier, extending benefits to persons becoming incapacitated prior to retirement age, etc., is indicated by the appointment of an advisory council to study needed amendments. The council consists of 24 members, representing employees, employers and the "public." Among the latter are Lucy R. Mason of the National Consumers' League, and Elizabeth Wisner of the Tulane University School of Social Work, who is president of the American Association of Schools of Social Work.

Joint Vocational Service Reports

The AASW policy is to invite current information on social work's centralized professional placement experience for the purpose of mutual benefit to the JVS and the Association's members.

The Joint Vocational Service in reporting for 1936, indicates marked increase in requests for vocational information and counsel from candidates. These requests bear chiefly on respective opportunity for doing a satisfactory job in the public and in the private agency, on the desirability for further professional preparation and what kind of preparation social agencies are requiring. There was increasing insistence on the part of candidates for information that would give as clear and true a picture of the positions to which they were referred as JVS attempts to give the organization about candidates being referred. While, particularly in this period when so many programs are being revamped and so many adjustments are being made in the total social work set-up in a community, it is exceedingly difficult to get wholly satisfactory information about the possibilities of a given position, it seemed a natural and reasonable attitude on the part of candidates to want assurance about the conditions under which they would be practising and about the likelihood of agency growth in this direction or that. As candidates' investment in preparation increases, the desire to be able to practise in an effective way naturally increases with that. A total of 2199 positions was listed with JVS during the year and 5165 candidates registered. Two-thirds of the positions were for social workers and the balance for public health nurses. A little less than three-fourths of the candidates registered were candidates for social work positions.

The experience of JVS is similar to the experience of other employment agencies in having a considerable number of positions cancelled after they are listed in good faith. They are withdrawn and not open to appointment chiefly because of failure of appropriation or fund raising, or because of change in plans within the agency. Of the 1665 positions on which some decision had been reached by the end of the year, one quarter were cancelled and 63 per cent were filled by JVS. Salaries ranged from $1000 to $7500. Thirty-nine per cent of the positions were in New York and Connecticut, 22 per cent in the middle Atlantic states, 18 per cent in the mid-west states, with others divided fairly evenly among the New England states (exclusive of Connecticut), the south, the western mountain states and the Pacific coast states with a few scattered positions in foreign countries. Residence is increasingly a requirement in the positions in public welfare organizations and enters in occasionally in the private agency positions.

Of the social work candidates registered, 1959 registered for the first time or reopened their registration during the year. Forty-eight per cent of these were graduates of schools of social work, more than two-thirds of whom were graduates of a graduate school of social work; 65 per cent had had a substantial amount of school preparation; and only 17 per cent were without benefit of any professional preparation in one of the recognized professional schools.

Closer working relationship developed during the year between JVS and the American Public Welfare Association and also with the Family Welfare Association of America. The personnel secretary of the APWA served as consultant to JVS in its personnel service to the public welfare field and made her headquarters in the office of the JVS when not in the field. The vocational secretary handling positions in the family field served jointly as a member of the staff of both organizations.

The staff of JVS numbered twenty-one in the latter part of the year, all of the positions then filled being continued into 1937. The cost of operation was $52,103.91. Income to meet this was received from the following sources: (1) placement fees, 31 per cent; (2) organizations, 38 per cent; (3) other sources, chiefly foundations, 31 per cent.

LILLIAN A. QUINN.

Salary Studies

Summaries by Ralph Hurlin of his recent studies of salaries, vacations and sick leave in private family case work organizations, which appeared in *The Family*, have now been made available in pamphlet form. The pamphlets includes: I. *Salaries in March*, 1936, (*The Family*, Dec., 1936); II. *Vacations, Hours of Work and Sick Leave in March*, 1936, (*The Family*, Jan., 1937); III. *Changes in Salaries*, 1929-1936, (*The Family*, Feb., 1937). These 1936 studies are the sixth of a series of periodic inquiries made by the Russell Sage Foundation, Department of Statistics, at the request of the Family Welfare Association of America, to provide data on the movement of salaries in family case work.

Supplementing these studies Mr. Hurlin made a separate analysis of salaries of case work personnel in ten private case work agencies in New York City and secured data on salaries for corresponding positions in the Emergency Relief Bureau for March, 1937, so that some comparison could be made of salaries in the public and private family agencies in New York City. This analysis, which was published in *Better Times* is also available in reprint form and both reprints may be secured through the national office of the AASW. The price of the larger pamphlet, *Salaries, Vacations and Sick Leaves*, is 15 cents and the reprint of the article on *Salaries in the Family Field in New York City* is 5 cents.

A study of salaries and qualifications of case workers, made under the auspices of the Chicago School of Social Service Administration at the request of the Council of Social Agencies, has also been published recently by The University of Chicago Press under the title of *Salaries and Professional Qualifications of Social Workers in Chicago*, 1935 (to be reviewed later).

Meeting on Spain at National Conference

As a stirring climax to its nation-wide drive for medical aid to the Spanish victims of fascist aggression, the Social Workers Committee of the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy has secured Ambassador Fernando de los Rios, former president of the University of Madrid, to speak on its program at the Indianapolis Conference, May 26th, at 3 P.M. This meeting, where Peter Kasius of the United Charities of St. Louis will preside, will be held in the Egyptian Ballroom of the Murat Auditorium, where the Conference is holding its general sessions. An interesting program is being prepared, and the Committee, whose National Chairman is Harald H. Lund, feels that a large attendance will show the interest of social workers in helping the people of war-torn Spain. Members of the committee include: Lillian Wald, Wayne McMillen, Mary Antoinette Cannon, Grace Coyle, Sheldon Glueck, Jacob Fisher, Paul Kellogg, Philip Klein, Hertha Kraus, Eduard Lindeman, Harry Lurie, Walter Pettit, Bertha Reynolds, Mr. and Mrs. Graham R. Taylor, Walter West, and Gordon Hamilton.

THE HIGH COST OF GIVING

The following statement was prepared by a special committee of the New York Chapter on Administrative Costs of Social Agencies. Members of the committee were Elizabeth Dexter, Chairman; Donald S. Howard, Secretary; Cora Kasius, Margaret Wead, Helen Fisk. Political attacks on the ERB, resulting in considerable misunderstanding on the part of the general public as to the meaning of administrative costs in social agencies, convinced the chapter that an interpretive statement by the professional group was needed. Other chapters and individual members concerned about similar attacks in their localities may find this statement useful.

No question in the whole field of social work is more subject to indiscriminating comment than that of costs of administration. This is a most natural field of interest since such vital problems as efficiency, avoidance of waste, and the very fulfillment of an agency's function seem to be reflected in the magic pool of administrative costs.

The average citizen has a wholesome and socially useful interest in seeing that relief clients receive as large a proportion of relief funds as possible, whether these funds are raised through voluntary contributions or taxation. This sentiment can be counted upon to generate opposition to graft, maladministration and waste in the handling of such funds. It may also be appealed to by the demagogue who wishes to discredit a social agency, for his own ulterior purposes, by charging that its administrative costs are too high.

Many people think there are only two kinds of relief expenditures: those for relief and those for administration. The expenditures for relief are often regarded as the only ones that bring any direct benefit to clients, while those for administration are frequently thought of only as the cost of giving money away, a seemingly necessary evil to be kept at a minimum which, no matter how low, is likely to be regarded as too high. These misconceptions, together with the great public concern to see as much of the

relief funds as possible conserved for the benefit of clients, present a challenge to social agencies to interpret their expenditures in less general terms.

The fallacy of considering what are usually called administrative costs solely as the cost of giving money away is immediately apparent when one realizes that administration is, in part, the cost of saving money and the cost of rendering service to clients. Expenses incurred in making investigations of applications for assistance are commonly regarded as administrative costs. Yet careful and adequate investigations are necessary, not only to determine who is eligible for assistance, and how much, but also to provide a factual basis for all future dealings with and treatment of clients. A significant part of the time of any agency's staff is taken up in determining whether applicants meet the legal, financial and social conditions of eligibility. It is not enough that investigations reduce the number of cases accepted for care; they should also disclose what resources, other than those offered by the agency, may be available to meet the needs of applicants or clients who really do require assistance even though they may not be eligible for, nor require, the particular kind of aid given by the agency. Social agencies render many characteristic services in helping applicants and clients liquidate assets tied up in real property or insurance, or in securing aid from members of their immediate families or other relatives. These latter services require especially delicate skills and discriminating social judgments if family ties and loyalties are to be preserved in the face of increased financial responsibilities, and if the agency is to avoid demanding support from relatives who are really not able to give any assistance without jeopardizing social values within their own homes. It would be poor social economy to rob Peter the baby in order to support Paul, his aged grandfather.

Expenditures for administration may keep down relief expenditures not only by reducing the number of applications accepted and the number of cases retained under care, but also by conserving the agency's resources through helping clients to become self-supporting. Perhaps the agency gives a client the medical care he needs to enable him to return to work, or, he may secure a job from an employer to whom he was referred by the agency's employment department. An agency may also help an individual to independence by stimulating his initiative in finding his own way to self maintenance. Although the costs of rendering all these social services are commonly regarded as administrative costs,—the costs of giving money away,—it must be obvious that they should be considered in large part, as the cost of conserving resources, and in part as the cost of securing assistance from sources other than the agency's own treasury.

It must be remembered, too, that relief costs saved by adequate social services cannot be measured by the saving realized in any one month, but must be multiplied by the number of months the client might have continued to receive assistance had the agency's service not made it unnecessary.

Administrative costs usually include not only the cost of saving money as well as giving it, but also the cost of services given as an integral part of relief. Because of the accounting difficulties involved, the financial reports of social agencies usually do not differentiate between service and administration, but include in their administrative costs all expenditures for the services of the agency's case workers, health unit, legal advisers, housing divisions, and employment service even though these services are actually rendered to and received by the client and are as necessary to him as cash or clothing. This difficulty in distinguishing between administration and service is not peculiar to social work, but is equally true of other professions. How would a doctor, lawyer or nurse differentiate between administrative or overhead costs on the one hand, and the value of their services on the other?

To the client who requires the service of a case worker or of a medical unit, these services are as essential as the bread, blouses and blankets which are given him. Nevertheless, because expenditures for these services are usually included in administrative costs, many people fail to see that they are a part of what is actually given the client.

If these issues are to be clarified, there will need to be definite efforts to interpret "administration" to show that it includes the cost of giving money, the cost of saving money and the cost of services which are in themselves an end, and have a value as real as money. This interpretation should help to break down the sharp distinction between "administration" and "relief."

But this re-interpretation of the *nature* of administrative costs will not, in itself, be sufficient. There must also be a broader interpretation of the factors which affect administrative and service costs. It is sometimes assumed, although fallaciously, that expenditures for these purposes can be reduced to some mystical percentage of total expenditures, and that different agencies, whatever their function and whatever their location should approximate this hypothetical ratio.

One might as well expect Hamlet to act like Touchstone as to expect two agencies to limit their administrative costs to a fixed proportion of their total expenditures, when each has its own

peculiar form of organization and procedure to render characteristic services to its particular group of clients. Even agencies with fairly comparable programs usually operate in such different social milieus that it is impossible to judge their relative efficiency simply by comparing the proportions of their expenditures which are spent for administration.

Obviously, the ratio between relief and administrative costs is determined by the relative amounts spent for each. Any factors that tend to increase or decrease either group of expenditures will, of course, affect the ratio between the two.

Among the most important factors that affect either or both of these two types of expenditure, is the nature of the case load served by an agency. One agency may have a larger proportion of so-called employable clients who must be encouraged to achieve their own self-support and for whom work opportunities must be sought. These services are costly. In addition, if efforts at placement or finding jobs are successful, some clients are likely to go on and off the relief rolls several times during a year, thus increasing administrative costs still more through repeated investigations, closings, and re-investigations. On the other hand, an agency with a large proportion of so-called unemployables can expect its case load to remain more static since cases of this kind are usually kept under care for relatively long periods of time. There is not likely to be a rapid turnover among cases where old age or dependent childhood or invalidity is the cause of dependency. The nature of the case load not only affects administrative and service costs, but also the amount of relief given. A large proportion of single persons or small families among an agency's cases would mean that it would spend relatively less for relief than an agency with a larger proportion of large families, yet there would be no comparable reduction in the costs of administration and service to the single persons and small families.

In some communities the earnings of part-time or underpaid workers are supplemented by partial relief. Although such persons usually receive relatively small relief grants, they require relatively more administrative attention and service because of the necessity of maintaining cooperative relationships with employers. An unusually large proportion of such cases would inevitably tend to increase the proportion of an agency's expenses going for administration and service both by increasing these expenditures and by reducing the amount of relief given. Comparisons between the administrative costs of two agencies would be valueless unless due allowances were made for the nature of the case load of each.

A second factor which affects administrative costs is the nature of the services performed by an agency. Whether an agency must give medical care, provide special diets, refer clients to potential employers or assist clients in liquidating frozen assets depends, of course, upon the special needs of its clientele, and upon the degree to which other community agencies, public or private, can be counted upon for specific services. The nature and extent of these special services will vary not only according to the nature of the agency's clientele, but also according to the proportion of its clients needing them.

In comparing services rendered by two agencies, one must be careful not to be carried away by names. Two agencies may each have a medical department, yet one department may exist only to discover cases needing medical attention and to refer them to other agencies for the actual care and treatment required, while the other may itself actually provide all the required treatment, hospitalization, home nursing, etc., out of its own funds, and through its own staff and personnel. Again, the adequacy of an agency's services is an important consideration. One agency may render medical care only in case of emergency or threatened death while another may give care more liberally, and even go so far as to render preventive care where indicated. Failure to distinguish between the "medical services" of these agencies, and also, of course, between their relative costs, would be as indefensible as confusing an ostrich with a chicken just because each has two legs.

Whether or not an agency must provide its own special services depends upon the degree to which they can be secured from other community agencies. For example, if an agency is located in a community where there is a highly organized and effective public employment office, it might not need to operate a department to refer clients to possible employers. Or, a well organized municipal housing or tenement authority would make it unnecessary for the agency to have its own housing division to see that no clients were housed in substandard dwellings or tenements. Adequate facilities for medical care, treatment, hospitalization or maternal care, might exist in the community to such an extent that the social agency need only refer clients to them, and need not actually pay for such services from agency funds. An agency located in a community where there was a good Insurance Adjustment Bureau might not need a special department to help clients liquidate assets tied up in insurance policies.

Comparisons of administrative and service costs between agencies are meaningless if they make no allowance for such factors as the nature and extent of services required by clients, and

the degree to which these must be furnished by the agency itself rather than by the community at large. It is also necessary to consider the services which an agency is expected to perform for other agencies. For example, public relief agencies are now rendering extensive services to such agencies as the WPA, NYA, and CCC. These functions involve the receipt and investigation of applications for employment, on WPA and NYA projects, enrollment in CCC camps, and requests for surplus commodities. It is frequently argued that this expenditure of effort by the social agency is fully justified since these services help families to augment their incomes in various ways. While a family's resources are thus supplemented, and the agency's relief funds are saved, it must be recognized that this affects the ratio between the agency's administrative and relief costs since the agency does more administrative work, but gives less relief because of the supplementary income.

Administrative and service costs are also affected by an agency's policies in giving relief. Work relief involves greater administrative and service charges than direct relief, yet may be far more desirable from a social point of view. Relief in the form of cash may be cheaper to administer than food, clothing and fuel orders. Another important factor is the frequency with which relief checks or orders are given. Are they given on a monthly, semi-monthly or weekly basis? This is an especially important consideration when administrative costs are computed in proportion to the relief given, for the more frequently orders and cash are issued, the greater will be the administrative costs involved. Yet, these larger administrative expenses may be expected to reduce relief costs, since there is greater opportunity for the immediate discontinuance of relief allowances to clients suddenly becoming ineligible because of changes in their situation.

The average and total amounts of relief given are all-important factors in considering the ratio of administrative and service costs to total costs. At any time, an agency can easily lower the proportion of its expenditures going for administration and service by increasing the amounts spent for relief. For example, if a social agency, with 2500 cases under care grants an average of $40 to each case in a given month, it would grant a total of $100,000 in relief. Let us assume that administrative and service costs total $10,000 or 10 per cent of the relief granted. If placed under pressure to reduce drastically the proportion of its expenditures for administrative and service costs, (as if that were the criterion for judging the efficiency of social agencies) it could solve the problem neatly by doubling the amount of relief given, thus reducing administrative and service costs to a mere 5 per cent. If the pressure were a little less severe, the monthly average relief grants might be increased only 25 per cent, or from $40 to $50, thereby reducing administrative and service costs from 10 per cent to 8 per cent. Whenever an agency spends more for relief because families are larger, or because grants are more nearly adequate or because less care is used in discontinuing grants to ineligible clients or for any other reason, it may alter the ratio between administrative and service costs on the one hand and expenditures for relief on the other.

Administrative and service costs may also be affected by an agency's social policies. For example, one agency may grant relief only to clients who prove themselves eligible, while another agency may feel obliged to help its clients establish eligibility. The assumption of such duties increases administrative and service costs, which if not borne by the agency, are likely to be paid for by the protracted hunger, suffering and misery of men, women and children while applicants struggle to corral the bits of proof and piece together the unbroken chain of evidence, which alone can entitle them to the assistance requested.

A final series of considerations that must be kept in mind when comparing the administrative and service costs of different agencies is the very structure of each, the quality of its personnel, its personnel practices, accounting practices, and the division of administrative labor between the agency itself and other agencies.

Administrative costs can be affected by the degree of decentralization of the agency's services. A small number of offices can probably be operated more cheaply than a larger number. Savings might be effected in rent, personnel and incidental expenses. Perhaps, however, there is a point beyond which centralization becomes more expensive than decentralization. The important factor is how well the organization's structure is suited to the needs of its clientele; how accessible are its offices to applicants and beneficiaries; and how expeditiously it can attend to questions, grievances and appeals.

Administrative and service charges may be further affected by the quality of personnel employed. Presumably untrained or inexperienced or unqualified workers can be employed at lower salaries than those who are trained, experienced and qualified. In order to reduce administrative and service expenses an agency might decide to employ less competent workers only to find its total expenditures increased by inadequate and ineffective administration.

Then there are the questions of the rates of pay and working conditions of employees. Suppose that in a given agency administrative and

service costs are being kept at a minimum by paying workers substandard wages, by demanding of them inordinate amounts of work, or by compelling them to work long hours overtime. If the agency's administrative and service costs are scrutinized in the light of the quality of the services rendered, and of the remuneration and working conditions of employees, it might be found that apparent economy was really no economy at all; or, that the economy was purchased at the price of inhuman demands upon employees and neglect of clients.

No personnel problem is more closely related to the matter of administrative costs than the size of an agency's staff in relation to its responsibilities. An agency's effectiveness may be dependent, in large part, upon the number of cases under the care of each case worker, and the number of case workers under the supervision of each supervisor. Increasing the amount of work expected of case workers and supervisors may decrease an agency's administrative and service costs, but it may also decrease that agency's chances of doing effective work. Unless an agency's staff is adequate it will not be able to render effective service nor to make careful investigations of applications, nor to review periodically the eligibility of cases under care. These services, of course, increase administrative and service costs, but also tend to reduce unwarranted expenditures for relief. Persons who complain constantly about high costs of administration are likely to miss the woods of genuine economy through preoccupation with the tree of administrative costs.

Especially in recent years employees in relief agencies have been carefully protected in the spending of relief funds. Many agencies are apparently committed to the policy of paying for expensive safeguards rather than to place too great temptation in the paths of their employees, or to suffer the misspending of even petty sums, and therefore require the signatures of several different workers before even small expenditures can be authorized. It is doubtful whether these re-checks of the double checks on expenditures save enough money to pay their own way.

Accounting practices differ from place to place, and affect profoundly all comparisons of administrative and service costs of different agencies. What one agency calls relief, another may call administration. For example, some agencies are known to charge as relief the costs of distributing surplus commodities, while others count such expenses as administrative costs. When some agencies employ former relief clients to perform administrative services as janitors or messengers they count the salaries paid them as relief, while others consider them administrative charges. Other similar variations in the accounting practice may influence appreciably the relative administrative costs of different agencies.

Finally, the division of responsibility between city, county and state offices may prove a vital factor in influencing administrative and service costs. A local agency may not need to maintain its own accounting or statistical or other specialized services since these may be rendered on some other level of the agency's organization. For example, one local relief agency might need to maintain a finance department to control its own funds, and to do its own auditing and accounting, whereas these services in another agency might be rendered by a district or state office. It cannot always be assumed that a local office will reduce its accounting or auditing staff merely because a district or state office establishes careful procedures to check its accounts. Frequently, the more rigid the checks imposed upon a given agency, the more careful it seeks to be in preventing errors and discrepancies.

Perhaps enough has now been said to indicate that there are innumerable factors which affect the so-called administrative and service costs of social agencies, and to indicate that such expenses which, at first blush, might appear to represent a high cost of giving, usually include wholly justifiable expenditures for conserving funds and rendering needed services. No judgment as to whether they are too high or too low can be sound unless it takes into account such factors as have been enumerated. Comparisons between agencies are particularly hazardous because of unstandardized methods of reporting expenditures, and the near impossibility of measuring the social efficiency of each agency in the light of other community resources and facilities that may be available. Because of these subtleties and vagaries is it to be concluded that there is nothing to be done about apparently excessive administrative and service charges of a given agency? Not at all. There is much to be done. The various purposes for which the agency spends its money can be carefully scrutinized and evaluated in the light of what its clientele needs, and what can be secured from other public or private agencies in the community. Some evaluations of the social efficiency and cost of the various services might also be attempted. These evaluations of the way in which a particular agency meets the needs of its particular clientele in its particular community can only be made by people who know something about the social needs of clients, methods of social treatment, and community resources. It is a mater for intensive study and expert diagnosis.

OUTLINE OF FEDERAL SERVICES

The following list of specific federal services particularly as they affect present social services set up in various departments may serve as an important source of reference for AASW members in two special connections:

1. They assist in an understanding of federal civil service announcements of examinations from which appointments will be made to fill positions for which social workers may qualify and be interested.

2. They show present set up of services and possible recommendations and modifications in connection with the work of the President's Committee on Administrative Management regarding welfare programs.

In suggesting the various possibilities for allocating these services to some federal department it is assumed that a new Department of Public Works and a Department of Social Welfare will be organized, and it is also assumed that the latter Department will include the federal government's public assistance, health and educational activities. At various points suggestions are made to transfer activities to the Division of Health, or Division of Education in the Department of Social Welfare. This is done with no intent to suggest the internal organization of that Department, but only to suggest that these activities be placed here because they are health or educational activities.

DIVISIONS OF CHILDREN'S BUREAU, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

	Present Location	*Possible Disposition*
1. Child Welfare Division (Advising states in re child welfare programs under Social Security Act.)	Children's Bureau	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Retain in Children's Bureau.
2. Maternal and Child Health Division; Crippled Children's Division; Public Health Nursing Unit (Cooperate with states in re maternal and child health and crippled children's services under the Social Security Act.)	Children's Bureau	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Health. Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Retain in Children's Bureau.
3. Social Service Division (Research, Statistical and Advisory services in re: Methods of care and legal provision for children in need of social services; methods of state and community organization for child care and protection.)	Children's Bureau	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Retain in Children's Bureau.
4. Division of Research in Child Development (Dir. Physician) (Research, Statistical and Advisory services in re health, growth and development of children, maternal and infant mortality and morbidity; maternal and child care in re social, economic and medical factors.)	Children's Bureau	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Health. Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Retain in Children's Bureau.
5. Delinquency Division (Research, Statistical, and Advisory services in re methods of prevention and treatment of conduct problems, including organization of community services; juvenile courts and probation; institutions for delinquents.)	Children's Bureau	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Retain in Children's Bureau.
6. Industrial Division (Research, Statistical and Advisory services in re laws and conditions affecting employment of minors, child labor, school attendance, workmen's compensation, employment conditions, occupational hazards, and vocational opportunities.)	Children's Bureau	Retain in Department of Labor. Transfer to Department of Social Welfare.
PUBLIC ASSISTANCE Aged Blind Dependent Children	Social Security Board (Independent Agency)	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Retain in Social Security Board.

	Present Location	*Possible Disposition*
FERA (Has been—"to relieve the hardships and suffering caused by unemployment and drought.")	WPA	Transfer remaining responsibilities to Department of Social Welfare.
WPA ("To provide relief and work relief on useful projects.")	Independent Agency	Retain in WPA. Transfer to Department of Public Works. Retain as independent agency. Transfer to Department of Labor.
CCC (To relieve distress and unemployment . . . and to restore natural resources and provide public works.)	Independent Agency	Dissolve program as such, and establish component elements, such as education, employment, etc., in different departments. Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Education. Transfer to Department of Public Works. Transfer to Department of Labor. Retain as independent agency.
NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION (To find and provide employment for jobless youths; to provide vocational guidance, training and retraining, and extend part-time employment to students.)	WPA	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Education. Dissolve program and establish component elements, such as education, employment, etc., in different departments. Transfer to Department of Labor. Transfer to Public Works. Retain in WPA.
FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION (To assist the AAA in the removal of surplus farm products by furnishing the machinery for the distribution of such products to state relief organizations.)	Independent Agency	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Transfer to Department of Agriculture. Retain as Independent Agency.
HOUSING ACTIVITIES Housing Division—PWA. Home Owners' Loan Corporation Federal Housing Administration	Independent—or in PWA	Combine into a Housing Authority, in Department of Social Welfare. Combine in Department of Public Works. Combine in some lending agency, such as RFC, and transfer to appropriate department. Combine all and retain as Independent. Retain as separate Independent Agencies.
SUBURBAN RESETTLEMENT (To provide low-rent housing and to demonstrate the feasibility of large scale town planning, economical land-use, and mass production of housing.)	Resettlement Administration, Department of Agriculture	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare and combine with other housing activities listed above. Transfer to Housing Division in another department that is appropriate. Retain in RA in Department of Agriculture. Transfer to Department of Public Works.

	Present Location	*Possible Disposition*
RURAL REHABILITATION Loans Grants Drought Relief (To make destitute and low income farm families self-supporting.)	Resettlement Administration, Department of Agriculture	Separate functions and give Department of Social Welfare responsibilities for making grants and giving relief, retaining in RA responsibility for loans. Transfer to Department of Social Welfare responsibility for loans also. Retain all in Department of Agriculture.
UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (Prevention of Communicable Diseases; Research and Dissemination of Public Health Information; Administration of Laws in re Manufacturing and Sale of Toxins, Serums, etc.; Cooperation with Other Health Agencies [Social Security Act]; Administers National Leper Home; Treatment of Mental Diseases in Penal Institutions.)	Department of Treasury	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Health. Retain as U. S. P. H. S., Department of Treasury.
HEALTH AND SANITATION (Of Indians and natives of Alaska.)	Office of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Health. Transfer to U. S. P. H. S. Retain in Office of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior.
INSTITUTION FOR DEAF (Columbia) (For deaf mutes of D. C. and certain others.)	Department of Interior	Place under jurisdiction of the District of Columbia. Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Education. Transfer to Office of Education, Department of Interior. Retain in Department of Interior.
HOSPITAL (Freedmen's), GENERAL (For residents of D. C. and certain others unable to pay.)	Department of Interior	Place under jurisdiction of the District of Columbia. Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Health. Transfer to U. S. P. H. S. or retain in Department of Interior.
HOSPITAL (St. Elizabeth's), MENTAL ILLNESS (Treatment for military and certain civilians; instruction Army and Navy medical schools and others; nurses' training; disseminates information on mental diseases.)	Department of Interior	Place under jurisdiction of the District of Columbia. Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Health. Transfer to U. S. P. H. S. Retain in Department of Interior.
HOSPITALS (VETERANS') (And facilities.)	Veterans' Administration	Retain in Veterans' Administration. Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Health.
OFFICE OF EDUCATION (Research; Local Cooperation; Vocational Education; Administration of Funds to Land Grant Colleges; Inspection of Howard University.)	Department of Interior	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Education. Separate the functions and transfer each to appropriate agency. Retain all in Office of Education.
HOWARD UNIVERSITY (For higher education of Negro youth.)	Department of Interior	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Education. Retain among Eleemosynary Institutions, Department of Interior.

	Present Location	*Possible Disposition*
EDUCATION (Of Indians and natives of Alaska.)	Office of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare, Division of Education. Transfer to Office of Education, Department of Interior. Retain in Office of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior.
BUREAU OF PRISONS (Supervision of federal penal institutions and prisoners, and of prison contracts and matters arising out of probation law.)	Department of Justice	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Retain in Department of Justice.
PAROLE BOARD (To grant and revoke paroles of federal prisoners.)	Bureau of Prisons (Department of Justice)	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Retain in Department of Justice.
FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC. (To provide employment of all physically fit inmates of U. S. penal and correctional institutions in occupations to minimize competition with private industry, and will provide articles and commodities for the use of the federal government and its agencies.)	Independent Agency	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Retain as Independent Agency.
PRISON INDUSTRIES REORGANIZATION ADMINISTRATION (Research—recommend reorganization of prison industries of states; and means of eliminating idleness, and promoting a humane system of rehabilitation.)	Independent Agency	Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Retain as Independent Agency.
FEDERAL OLD AGE BENEFITS	Social Security Board (Independent Agency)	Transfer to Department of Labor. Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Retain in Social Security Board.
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD (To administer annuities for railroad employees.)	Independent Agency	Transfer to Department of Labor. Retain in Railroad Retirement Board.
VETERANS' PENSIONS (And relief.)	Veterans' Administration (Independent Agency)	Retain both in Veterans' Administration. Separate pension and relief functions and transfer former to Department of Labor and latter to Department of Social Welfare. Retain pensions in Veterans' Administration and transfer relief to Department of Social Welfare.
UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION	Social Security Board (Independent Agency)	Transfer to Department of Labor. Transfer to Department of Social Welfare. Retain in Social Security Board.
U. S. EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION (To administer benefits for civil employees of the U. S. suffering personal injuries in performance of official duties.)	Independent Agency	Transfer to Department of Labor. Retain as Independent Agency.

* * * *

Cooperative relationships with the following organizations,

The Pan-American Sanitary Bureau
The International Office of Public Health at Paris
The American Institute for the Protection of Childhood

should be delegated to the proper department.

Cooperation with the first two might be delegated to the Division of Health in the Department of Social Welfare or to the U. S. P. H. S.; cooperation with the third agency might be delegated to the Department of Social Welfare or to the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor.

The Division of Territories and Island Possessions and the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration undoubtedly administer welfare, educational and health functions. Nevertheless, no account is taken of them here, because of insufficient information about them and the complicated nature of territorial and insular relationships.

Miss Edna Zimmerman 2
1016 South 4th St.
Springfield Illinois

NEW AASW PUBLICATIONS

FOUR PAPERS ON PROFESSIONAL FUNCTION

Published in One Pamphlet

Given at the
1937 DELEGATE CONFERENCE

The Professional Base for Social Action
—McMillen

The Administrative Function in Social Work
—Robinson

Some Professional Questions About Relief
—Kahn

The Professional Function: Its Nature, Responsibilities and Limitations
—Marcus

Price of Pamphlet 50 Cents Per Copy, Post Paid

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION *of* SOCIAL WORKERS
130 East 22nd Street
New York, N. Y.

Please accept my order for..... copies of "Four Papers on Professional Function." 50 cents per copy, post paid.
Attached is my check or money order for $.....

Mail to address indicated.

Name.....

Street and No.....

City or Town.....

State.....

(Please print plainly)

UNEMPLOYMENT AND ITS TREATMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

By Dorothy C. Kahn

A comprehensive description and critical analysis of unemployment relief and security measures. Valuable for teachers, students, agencies and legislators, as well as practicing social workers.

Price $1.00 Per Copy, Post Paid

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION *of* SOCIAL WORKERS
130 East 22nd Street
New York, N. Y.

Please accept my order for..... copies of "Unemployment and Its Treatment in the United States." $1.00 per copy, post paid.
Attached is my check or money order for $.....

Mail to address indicated.

Name.....

Street and No.....

City or Town.....

State.....

(Please print plainly)

N.B.—Only those orders accompanied by check or mon ey order can be accepted.